

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 9-15 are amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 12 and 13 are amended to change the phrase "a computer having a program" to "a computer-readable medium having a program". Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,348,971) in view of Aoki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,008). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding and solely in the interest of expediting prosecution, claims 1-3 and 10-15 are amended. Claims 4-8 inherit these amendments due to their dependency on an amended base claim.

The amended claims now recite that if the output device/network printer receives specialized data which contains conditions indicating that output/printing should be done on conditions indicating that output/printing should be done on another output device/printer, it transfers the resulting intermediate print data to the other output device/printer, and if the output device/network printer receives specialized data which contains conditions indicating that output/printing should be done on the output

device/network printer itself, it does the output/printing based on the received specialized print data. Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 58, lines 1-12 of the originally filed application. Support for reciting "output" instead of "print" is supported at least at page 61, line 23 - page 62, line 7 of the originally filed application.

The above-mentioned feature expresses the next steps of the previously-claimed method and sets forth that once a printer driver for a specific network printer has been installed on the user terminal, printing can be done relatively appropriately using a plurality of network printers.

Neither Owa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,348,971) nor Aoki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,008) teach or suggest this feature. As such, even if the references are combined, the combination does not yield the claimed invention. As such, these references cannot anticipate or rendered the claimed invention obvious.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,008) and in view of Owa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,348,971). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, claim 9 is amended in the same manner as the other independent claims. Aoki and Owa cannot render this subject matter obvious for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 13, 2008

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/pvd]